



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,709	11/24/2003	Nick T. Cheng		1075

7590 04/03/2007
Golden Concept International, Inc.
2537 James Maury Drive
Herndon, VA 20171

EXAMINER

CHOW, CHIH CHING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2191

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,709

Applicant(s)

CHENG, NICK T.

Examiner

Chih-Ching Chow

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 November 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on November 24, 2003.
2. The priority date considered for this application is November 24, 2003.
3. Claims 1-2 have been examined.

Specification

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abbreviations of 'AIMS' and 'CMC' should be spelled out when the first time it is used. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: all the abbreviations should be spelled out the first time it is used, such as "ETL". Appropriate correction is required.
6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the word 'planer' should be 'planner' through out the entire application. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: the numbers 1-25 are not mentioned in the description. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2191

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 1 is rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

10. Claim 2 is rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The claim(s) must describe the subject matter for the invention, not the names of the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

11. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the condition and requirements of this title.

12. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter; claims 1 and 2 can be reasonably interpreted as software per se; on this basis, claim rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2191

14. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,789,252 by Burke et al., (hereinafter "Burke"), in view of well known ISO/IEC 11179.

As Per claim 1, Burke discloses:

I claim a design of integrated system functional and corporate foundation database architecture, AIMS informationbase, in an inhomogeneous distributed corporate IT environment, which comprise the management functionalities, corporate foundation database architecture and business automation architecture and operations. And it is operated as an integral part of the enterprise process. It comprises (1) Business knowledge management (7) a foundation database comprising the business and project information database, metadatabase, and business automation rule base

Burke's disclosure teaches a business object management method that teaches management functionalities, operated as an integral part of the enterprise process, see Burke's column 2 line 67 into column 3, line 5, "the present invention makes specifications processible, one can **automatically** verify whether a requested specification is manufacturable. In addition, information known by an **enterprise's knowledge** workers can be captured and applied within the **enterprise** or shared with others in object specification form." And Abstract, "A method and system are provided for providing an open and extensible object definition framework that **manages business object** definitions as specifications. This framework may be used to dynamically define any object that is to be processed by a computer. Objects can include Properties, Classifications, **Knowledge, Business Objects, and Business Rules** (items (1) and (7)) to name a few. Some examples of typical Business Objects include: business and social entities; locations, including spaces, places and channels; **activities**, including events and processes; items, including products and services;

and **business records**, including orders and other forms of demand, inventory, jobs, deliverables, statements, transaction history et. al.”

(2) information planning and management

And Burke’s column 42, lines 59-63, “Integration--The Order Management System can be configured to communicate with existing enterprise applications such as Manufacturing Execution Systems, Credit Systems, Warehouse Management Systems, and Advanced **Planning Systems**.” (item (2)).

(3) business automation and application design, construction (by one-push-button) and testing

Burke’s claim 64, “specifying the ingreditential object as user derivable in the parent model definition; **displaying a derive button** next to any instantiated object’s displayed ingreditential object when ‘user derivable’ is true; and invoking the ingreditential object or ingreditential object set processing method **when the button is activated by a user**; *(by one-push-button)* whereby execution of the ingreditential object or the object processing set is invoked by a **derive button** associated with the ingreditential object.” And Burke’s column 14, lines 40-42, “Product experts define the element to element rules that apply to products. These **rules are tested** *(testing)* during order entry or manually using CCM.”

(4) project and document (Corporate and Web, XL semantic or non-XML) management

Burke’s column 14, lines 12-39, “**Extensible Markup Language (XML)**. A standardized formatting notation, **created for structured document** interchange on the World Wide Web. **XML** describes a class of data objects called **XML** documents and partially describes the behavior of programs that process these objects. **XML** is a subset, or restricted form, of SGML (the Standard Generalized

Markup Language--ISO 8879). XML allows designers to create their own customized tags, enabling the definition, transmission, validation, and interpretation of data between applications and between organizations. XML has been approved by the **World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) recommendation.**"

(5) modeling management

Burke's column 25, lines 54-62, under '**Model Management**', "In accordance with the invention, **models can be managed in a hierarchy of models.** In this arrangement each model inherits content from its parent, then refines and elaborates on this content to form a more definitive model. Models contained in a hierarchy can be located by browsing or by a search that targets the model's attributes. Selection of a model source can also be the result of browsing a knowledge hierarchy to find products or other areas of interest that include nodes that execute as search templates."

(6) user business automation applications operation and management

Burke's column 1, lines 25-30, "it relates to a method and apparatus for creating and applying dynamically defined business objects used in such computer systems, for using such business objects to configure business software applications, and for facilitating the **automated sharing of business information across a business enterprise** or with other business enterprises or customers."

(8) AIMS generated and managed user operation databases. In addition, the metadatabase comprises the ISO 11179 metamodel.

Burke teaches all the aspects of claim 1, but he does not mention 'ISO 11179' specifically, however ISO 11179 Metadata Registries is a well known technical standard, it would have been obvious for the people of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include ISO/IEC 11179 metamodel to his/her

invention in order to meet technical standards in the field (see Burke's column 41, lines 56-67).

As I claimed in claim 1, a design of an informationbase fundamental enterprise model addresses Information Technology issues from a comprehensive approach. The design of applying a single information object entry in the foundation database is for discovering of any information object in an enterprise.

See claim 1 item (1) rejection, and Burke's column 37, lines 40-43, "The processes used to satisfy demands, particularly those that exist between buyers and sellers, can be modeled, **defined and executed using dynamically definable business objects** created and managed using the invention's business object definition components and methods." Burke's disclosure if for discovering of any information object in an enterprise.

As I claimed in claim 1, a one-push-button automated generating of the business application automation, database(s), and project documents, is a fully information automation by using the AIMS informationbase.

See claim 1 items (3) and (4) rejections, Burke's disclosure if for discovering of any information object in an enterprise.

As I claimed in claim 1, this integrated generic platform architecture is operated as an integral part of the enterprise process. This specific feature enables the enterprise to alter business process in real time dimension.

See Burke's column 26, lines 8-10, "The invention's tandem collaboration functionality allows a supplier to take Internet enabled orders **real-time**, while a customer watches or verifies the building of the order and the product spec during

customer's order entry.” – Burke’s disclosure also enables the enterprise to alter business process in real time dimension.

As I claimed in claim 1, a design of virtual metadatabase in an inhomogeneous distributed corporate IT environment comprises an organized data semantics database, physical database related metadata repositories, standard code set and reference databases.

See Burke’s column 13, lines 35-42, “Internet Inter-ORB Protocol (IIOP). A protocol developed by the Object Management Group (OMG) to implement CORBA solutions over the World Wide Web. IIOP enables browsers and servers to exchange integers, arrays, and more complex objects, unlike HTTP, which only supports transmission of text. The OMG is an international consortium of organizations involved in various aspects of client/server **computing on heterogeneous platforms.**”; further column 14, lines 3-10, “Java Database Connectivity (JDBC). A Java API developed by JavaSoft, a subsidiary of Sun Microsystems. JDBC enables **Java programs to execute SQL statements** (*standard code set and reference database*). This allows Java programs to interact with any SQL-compliant database. Since nearly all relational database systems (RDBMSs) support SQL, and because Java itself runs on most platforms, JDBC makes it possible to write a single database application that can **run on different platforms** and interact with different DBMS”. Also see FIGs. 30, 31, and column 34, lines 11-17, “Those skilled in the art will recognize that there a many suitable computer configurations that will provide the functionality of the Web server computer, the application server computer and the database server computer. This functionality **may be distributed over a different number of suitable computers.** For example, the application server computer and database server computer may be the same computer.” – Burke’s disclosure is in an

inhomogenous (*heterogeneous platforms*) distributed corporate IT environment comprising an organized physical databases.

As I claimed in claim 1, my enterprise data model implemented enhanced ISO/IEC 11179 metamodel in my metadatabase for data semantics and for technical metadata consolidation.

See claim 1 item (8) rejection.

As Per claim 2,

- I claim that AIMS comprises my state-of-art intelligent Computer-Managed Computer (CMC) automation technology, which has never been published in the public arena.

Please see claim 1 rejections.

Conclusion

15. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

IBM Tivoli Business Systems Manager, constructs line of business views that reflect the current applications and business systems within the enterprise, and consolidates information scattered throughout the enterprise for a single command and control focal point, and integrates with change management systems, scheduling systems and automation systems to provide a single view of the overall status and health of system resources, and enabling real-time monitoring.

Morgan et al., US Patent No. 5,799,286, teaches a system and method for developing specialized data processing systems for tracking items through a business process. The method allows rapid creation of a specific data processing system based upon a series of generic process rules previously developed and stored in the system. Process activity definitions, activity paths transitions, data access, and operator

Art Unit: 2191

interaction panels are defined. Based upon the user supplied inputs and generic rules, a complete data processing system is generated.

Tozer, Guy V. "Metadata Management for Information Control and Business Success", Boston Artech House, Inc., 1999.

16. The following summarizes the status of the claims:

35 USC § 112 (2) rejection: Claims 1, 2

35 USC § 101 rejection: Claims 1, 2

35 USC § 103 rejection: Claims 1, 2

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chih-Ching Chow whose telephone number is 571-272-3693. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Chih-Ching Chow

Examiner

Art Unit 2191

March 30, 2007

CC



WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER